DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 204 SP 036 816

AUTHOR Wheeler, Edyth J.; Mallory, Walter D.
TITLE Team Teaching in Educational Research: One Solution to the Problem of Teaching Qualitative Research.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; Higher Education; Methods Courses; *Qualitative Research; Required Courses; *Research Methodology; *Teaching Models; *Team Teaching; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Research Teaching Relationship

ABSTRACT

Team teaching provided a model for real-world collaborative research efforts in a doctoral level course in research methodology. The instructors--one bringing extensive experience in teaching statistical methods and program evaluation; the other specializing in conducting qualitative research--used a constructivist framework for the course, building on the experiences that students brought from their own backgrounds. Problems encountered included bias toward a specific methodology and difficulties in switching from qualitative to quantitative or the reverse. Team teaching led to strategies to help students understand and value both kinds of research and provided a meaningful context and active hands-on learning. Students indicated that they felt most solid using the approach of their first course, and all insisted that qualitative research should be their first course, suggesting the importance of understanding studies encountered in background reading. Anecdotal data from students revealed that attempts to integrate qualitative methods had been less than successful in practice. Team teaching offered two ways to explain things, strengthened the instructors' teaching through collaboration, and provided students with a thorough introduction to both qualitative and quantitative methods through varied perspective and experiences. (Contains 18 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 204

Team Teaching in Educational Research:

One Solution to the Problem of Teaching Qualitative Research

Edyth J. Wheeler and Walter D. Mallory

George Mason University

Fairfax, VA 22030

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Wheeler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper Presented at the American Education Research Association

1996 Annual Meeting

April 12, 1996

New York, NY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3

S1638816

Team Teaching in Educational Research:
One Solution to the Problem of Teaching Qualitative Research

Edyth J. Wheeler and Walter D. Mallory

Introduction to the Presentation

In an effort to infuse more qualitative research into survey courses on educational research methods, two adjunct faculty members in the George Mason University Graduate School of Education pooled their talents in a team teaching design.

This presentation will show how courses for both the masters and doctoral levels were planned, implemented, and refined through three semesters of teaching. Team teaching provided a strong model for real-world collaborative research efforts and also generated a balanced syllabus that was then successfully taught by a single faculty member.

What began as a way to balance initial exposure to methodologies became an effective strategy for helping students address their assumptions about paradigms of research in education. We hope that our experience will provide other research faculty with some strategies for teaching qualitative research in conjunction with quantitative methods and statistics.

Background: Increasing Demand for Qualitative Methods

Educational research benefits from both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Traditionally educational research courses have emphasized quantitative methods, while in classroom practice, counseling and administration, qualitative research is often used to answer the questions that teachers and other practitioners are asking. It is an also important component of action/teacher research and program evaluation and is gaining support in the academic community.

Teacher Researcher Teachers in small groups around the country have adopted many of the methods of qualitative research to conduct "teacher research." Teacher researcher, also identified as collaborative action research, action research, and practitioner research is becoming part of practice in many school divisions. Locally, the Fairfax County Public Schools have fostered a number of collaborative teacher researcher groups which has led to demand for a more balanced methodological approach in research classes.

Business Case Study The case study method, made famous by the Harvard Business School, is utilized by many graduate business public administration programs as well as some programs in

educational administration. Case study method, while more a pedagogical device, does lend support to the notion that not all truth emerges from quantitative inferential inquiry.

Program Evaluation The field of program evaluation has long recognized the value of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. In the pursuit of practical guidance for policy makers, program evaluators have shown little patience with academic hair-splitting over paradigms, instead preferring to use what tools are available to provide the best information on the question at hand. (Worthen and Sanders, 1987)

BPRs Business Process Redesign, a movement embraced by many public and private organizations to improve organizational effectiveness, utilizes many of the data gathering processes of qualitative methodology, including unstructured interviews, observations, text analysis, and focus groups. (Butler Group, 1996).

More Background: What Have Others Done in Teaching Qualitative Research

Our paper was inspired by Stallings' (1995) call to "initiate a dialogue with those...who, although not trained formally in the area, nevertheless teach qualitative research methods, either as a unit in an introductory educational research course or as a 'stand-alone' ethnography or qualitative research course" (p. 31). We are grateful for the thorough review of the situation by Webb and Glesne (1992). Although we would expect that some development has occurred since their 1992 study, Stallings suggests that the issue is still of concern. Questions about effective and meaningful ways of teaching qualitative research not yet been resolved.

The few articles on teaching qualitative research agree that the task is not an easy one, nor is there one agreed-upon approach (Dana, 1994; Laneau, 1987; Stallings, 1995; Webb & Glesne, 1992). Several strategies have been described for semester courses, none without acknowledging the challenges. We have found nothing in the literature about infusing qualitative research in a meaningful way into an introductory survey course, in which the weeks of the semester (and the students' attention) must be shared with quantitative research. Two strategies for teaching qualitative research described in the literature field-based experiences and reading examples of research.

Field-based Research Experiences. Most concur that one cannot teach qualitative research simply by describing it nor can students learn by only hearing a lecture or reading a textbook on the topic. (There are, we should mention, more and more books on qualitative research appearing, but the treatment of qualitative research is still not as thorough as one would like in general educational research texts.) Learning by doing gives students direct experience in selecting a site, gaining access, collecting and analyzing data and writing up results. These field-based

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

courses can also have their drawbacks. Stallings shares his concerns about a nine-week research assignment in which students have problems both the research question and the analysis. Webb and Glesne (1992) further caution against prematurely putting students in the field to do research, in which they end up confirming their own assumptions, "in a celebration of their own world view" (p. 779). Field research is often a solitary enterprise, problematic for student researchers. Laneau (1987) and Dana (1994) suggest strategies for integrating experiences in the field with the social context of the classroom.

Reading Examples of Research. Another recommended strategy is reading qualitative research. Books are effective for immersing students in the research to give them a true "feel" for what is meant by qualitative research. Examples are The Cocaine Kids (Williams, 1989), Worlds of Pain (Rubin, 1976), God's Choice (Peshkin, 1986), and Tell Them Who I Am (Leibow, 1993). Research articles can also provide a window into the world of qualitative research. However, articles and even books are often written seamlessly with little or no explanation of the research process. Reading them may leave students in the dark or, worse, unconvinced. Those who teach these courses continue to be grateful to Whyte (1955) for his sharing his methodology for Street Corner Society (Laneau, 1987; Stallings, 1995; Webb & Glesne, 1992).

Problems Encountered. Perhaps the most important issue in teaching qualitative research is addressing the assumptions that students bring (Webb & Glesne, 1992). Envisioning research in a positivistic/scientific method framework, they question the value of qualitative research, asking "What good is it if you can't prove something?" Examining this assumption leads to confronting the idea of multiple realities and considering the possibility that no research is value-free. If students have not yet met up with this struggle through readings such as The Social Construction of Reality (Berger & Luckman, 1967), this experience in cognitive disequilibrium may cause puzzled looks and furrowed brows.

Moving on to teaching design elements of the qualitative course, instructors find students looking for specific procedures and step-by-step guidelines for conducting research. Students may be uncomfortable with the "murkiness" of this methodology described by Webb and Glesne (1992), with no clear-cut answers to how long to be in the field, how many participants to interview, and so forth. Another area of difficulty occurs as students impose their own ideas and values on the data. This problem has an impact on forming the research question and reappears in the data analysis. Qualitative research asks students to take the difficult step away from their taken-for-granted assumptions and to look for *participants'* meanings instead of imposing their own.

Theoretical Overview

Naturalistic/Positivistic Continuum

Our basic theoretical position is consistent with phenomenology (Berger & Luckman, 1967). The notion of multiple realities socially constructed resonates with qualitative research and also is supports with the view that there is not one "right way" to conduct research. Essentially we accept the view that that there is no one truth-with-a-capital T in social science, nor perhaps in any science.

The basic understandings, or "world views," of quantitative and qualitative research are clearly different, reflecting their contrasting positivistic and naturalistic perspectives. Once that distinction is understood, however, the issue becomes "what question do you want to ask?" How best to answer the question then will determine the methodology. In our team teaching, we present the idea of a methodological continuum where the two approaches are complementary. As Shulman (1981) advises, "We must first understand our problem,and decide what questions we are asking. then select the mode of *disciplined inquiry* most appropriate to those questions" (p.12).

Constructivism

Our teaching perspective reflects a constructivist framework, which allows students to create an understanding of what they learn in an active and meaningful way. Hoping to teach as we would have teachers themselves teach, we work to build on the experiences that students bring from their own experience. Adult learners also take ownership of their own learning. In addressing the possibility of multiple realities and developing an understanding of qualitative research, students must construct their own knowledge. In Piagetian terms, students may encounter disequilibrium, or cognitive conflict, as they confront this new paradigm of research and must "accommodate" their research schema to include ethnography along with experimental designs and asking "what is happening" as well as testing hypotheses. In graduate classrooms, students encounter and make sense of new ideas in reading, discussion, and "doing" pieces of research.

Program Description

Antecedents. Education Research is required for the master's degree in all education programs at George Mason University. In the doctoral program, following this survey course, students take additional semester courses in both qualitative and quantitative methods. Courses at both levels

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

emphasize the interpretation and application of research methods. Students learn to evaluate research studies and use appropriate methods in designing and conducting studies.

Our course was the vision of Dr. Evelyn Jacob, the qualitative specialist in the school of Education, to infuse a greater emphasis on qualitative research in survey courses at master's and doctoral levels. She identified two persons to design a team-taught master's course in methodology in the summer of 1994. Each instructor contributed an area of expertise: one has extensive experience in teaching statistical methods and program evaluation; the other has specialized in conducting qualitative research. The course was designed and piloted in two sections of EDRS 590 which met twice a week for eight weeks. The syllabus provided an equal number of class meetings for qualitative and quantitative research. Of the two sections taught each semester, one addressed quantitative methods first and the other qualitative first. The instructors met together with the classes for two sessions at the beginning and one at the end of the semester.

This experience, owing to the enthusiasm of the instructors and the faith of the Dr. Jacob, led to the development of a similar course at the doctoral level (EDRS 810). In the second semester of team teaching, the doctoral program was planned as two sections meeting simultaneously in adjoining classrooms, in "shadow scheduling." In this way, some classes could be held with the entire group. After two joint class meetings, students from each section then chose which method they would start with and the sections were "regrouped."

Planning. The first step was to assemble previous syllabi from several instructors, and then to discuss and debate "what students really need to learn" about both research approaches. A strength of the team-teaching plan was the actual experience in different types of research that each instructor could share. The challenge in the initial planning was that the quantitative specialist had to pare his syllabus down to the essentials that students need to learn; the qualitative instructor had to extend the usual two session presentation and yet also pare down from a full semester syllabus. Standard educational research texts were extended with qualitative research articles (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993; McMillan & Schumacher, 1993). The doctoral class also used Bogdan and Bicklen's (1992) text on qualitative research.

Implementation. Webb and Glesne (1992) describe categories of research course approaches. Ours most closely resembles their "design" course, to "focus on some underlying principles of qualitative research and help students plan qualitative studies. Students may read and critique qualitative studies and often are required to write a research proposal" (p.787). We also include hands-on, "in-class" research experiences.

The basic components of the class are (1) overview and theoretical orientation, including proposal writing and research questions (6 hours) (2) quantitative analysis (approximately 12

hours including experimental design, threats to validity, descriptive, simple regression, t-tests, one and two-way fixed effect ANOVA). (3) qualitative research (approximately 12 hours including qualitative design, field work issues (access and entry, role of the researcher), data collection (interviews and observations), data analysis (coding, categorizing, constant comparative method, using computer programs), (4) approximately 3 hours of current trends in teacher/practitioner research, and (5) 6 hours synthesizing activities including presentations and reactions to individual proposals, and "roundtables" where class members discuss and report out on a variety of issues and topics related to a holistic view of educational research methods.

Course requirements include (1) a short bibliography of research journals in the students' primary field of study, (2) a short critical review of a quantitative research article and a qualitative article, (3) a statistical problem set comprised of 10 small data sets and accompanying research scenarios. (4) a small group project collecting and analyzing qualitative data from either individual or focus group interviews (5) a research proposal including rationale, literature review, methodology, limitations, budget, and timeline. (6) culminating activity either traditional (take-home essay) or non-traditional (round tables).

Course activities varied in different semesters and at different levels but each course included active learning experiences, "doing" the components of research. Letting go of the common format designing and conducting a mini-study in one semester, the instructors focused on "process" rather than "product." Cooperative groups were used for statistical data analysis problems and interview assignments.

Constructivism in Action

Constructing knowledge was a guiding principle in planning classroom experiences. The first two classes, taught jointly, presented both quantitative and qualitative research perspectives together. The class brainstormed "What does research mean to you?" Through their responses, grouped words and phrases were used to develop a definition of research and provided the students' first example of grounded theory. This activity showed the range of methods as well as the students' feelings and attitudes toward research. What did the students come up with? Some of the words were: *hypothesis, data, experiment, scientific method, question, results, sample, organized, explore, investigate, analyze, observe, inquiry, conclusions, white jackets, tedious, complicated*. Building their definition, we hoped to bring out the words *"disciplined inquiry"* (Shulman, 1981). Linking parts of speech (adjectives, verbs, nouns) into a sentence, the classes were able to create definitions fairly close to textbook.

Reintroductions took place as the students regrouped to begin their weeks of qualitative research. They were asked, "Are you a qualitative researcher?" and "What do you do (in your

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

non-student life) that is research?" The "aha!" experience occurred as students began to see evidence of qualitative methods in real life. "I never knew I was doing research!"

In the first semesters, students helped us "build" the course to meet their needs. This pioneering effort was consistent with the emerging design of qualitative research. For instance, a cooperative group interview activity worked well in the master's level course. Many of the doctoral students, we found, already had extensive interviewing experience in their professional lives. For their course, we developed the focus group project, known in the first doctoral group as "The Emerging Focus Group Activity." Students planned their topic and chose roles as moderators, group members, or observers. Each role provided hands-on data collection: the moderators planned and conducted the interview, the observers chose how and what to observe during the focus group, and the focus group members were sent to the campus "quad" for field observations while their classmates did their planning. The focus group generated a transcript which the whole class later used for an experience with preliminary analysis with "coding" and "indexing" and for individual reflections.

The quantitative element of this course also contains some constructivist elements. Students are encouraged to look at research design and inferential statistics as practical problems for which solutions must be found. The goal is to "demystify" statistics. It has been our experience that even advanced students who have learned how to use SPSS, or some other sophisticated statistical package, often treat the actual calculation process as a "black box" into which they pour data and receive answers. To address this challenge, students construct meaning from methodological problems. For example, the standard deviation is first presented as a solution to the problem of adequately representing a data set with widely different variances but similar means. Similarly correlations and X^2 statistics are treated as solution to the question of determining the magnitude of relationship between variables. Inferential statistics is introduced as a set of solutions to the problems of internal and external validity. In all cases "conceptual" formulas are used instead of the typical computational formulas. For example, if students are adequately introduced to the concept of a z, then using the following formula for a Pearson r makes is easier to understand as the average cross-product. While students may be required to use a few more steps in hand calculations, they can always refer to this base concept.

$$\frac{\Sigma z_x z_y}{N}$$

Most of the students in this class have had some cursory experience with statistics either in undergraduate or master's degree programs. However, when exposed to this approach students have expressed that statistics and the relation to research methods are transformed from the magical to the concrete.

The Problems and Our Efforts to Resolve Them

One interesting problem that was encountered is the difficulty associated with biases towards a specific methodology. Making no attempt to explain this with learning styles or personality theory, we observed that for many students one methodology or the other tended to resonate. When we first broke into two sections, we gave students the choice of which methodology they would study first. For the most part, those choosing quantitative had had some experience with quantitative methods and responded easily to such concepts as the central limit theorem. Their biases toward a quantitative reality were affirmed and strengthened. When they switched to the qualitative instructor there were some initial difficulties.

When the qualitative group switched to the quantitative section, there were similar difficulties. They found the reductionist nature of quantitative research to run counter to the rich and thick data they had just experienced. Interestingly, this expressed itself as ongoing skepticism about quantitative conclusions. This generated some productive discussions but was not a barrier to understanding.

In the transition we found music to be powerful metaphor to help students to realign their conceptual framework. For example, qualitative research was compared to the disciplined but improvisational nature of jazz (Oldfather and West, 1994). Quantitative was compared to the tight counterpoint of Bach.

Another strategy was developed mid-semester after the students had been immersed in the ways of quantitative methods. In brainstorming qualitative research questions, words such as "effects," "comparing groups," "hypothesis" and "variables," persisted. At the next class meeting, the qualitative brought a cake tin. The students were all asked to write down quantitative words on slips of paper, which were then deposited in the can, to be returned at the end of the qualitative weeks (Some were happy to deposit "multiple regression," "Pearson r," and "ANOVA.") This spontaneous and highly symbolic strategy seemed to be effective. If class members "slipped" and used one of the deposited words, they were vigorously chastised by their peers.

Looking for "cookbook" answers to the qualitative research remained a challenge, although the class became accustomed to the repeated references to "it depends on your research question," to the words "continuum," such as the range of approaches to interviewing and participation, and the key word "emerging." Sharing their thoughts as they worked through proposal ideas together brought some of these ideas into focus.

With articles and book excerpts, the problem persists about that qualitative articles usually do not explain process of data collection and particularly analysis. We used portions of Elliot

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Leibow's (1993) Tell Them Who I Am for a fine explanation of his process. Parrott's (1972) "The Ethnography of Second Grade Recess" describes participant-defined categories and provides some comic relief as we learn in her study about "games, tricks, and fooling around," such as the "rules" of pastimes like "Smash a Snowball on Someone's Head" (p. 212).

Stallings (1995) calls for "5-10 pages of field notes for coding, categorizing, searching for themes" (p.32) Our focus group transcript was useful. Introducing data analysis by talking to students about finding themes and coding is met with blank faces or puzzled expressions. What a striking contrast to watch those faces as they struggle with their own data. In the group analysis, students began to feel for categories that were too broad, too narrow, too many, or too analytical. In their line by line analysis, they addressed their own and each others' imposed values. They asked, "Does it really say that? Where?"

Like Webb and Glesne (1992), we hoped to confront the issues of assumptions and multiple realities. These aspirations shaped our evaluation of the course.

Evaluation Data

We have framed our evaluation according to some orienting questions which emerged as we taught. Our data sources have included course products (reflections following the focus group experience, the problem sets, proposals and roundtable responses) and on interview data (students and instructor of the advanced course). The questions we have addressed are:

- Did the students meet the course objectives?
- Were the students prepared for their next course? (What was left out as we expanded the qualitative focus?)
- How did we do in awakening minds to "confront multiple realities"?

Reflections on Focus Group and On Qualitative Research These brief individual essays provided frank reflections on the process and on the students' feelings at this point toward qualitative research. As the entire focus group assignment was a process versus product model, students seemed comfortable in sharing their thoughts: "Our group really didn't seem to get it." "We couldn't agree on what to look at." "Do real researchers have this trouble?" Other responses follow:

Carol: One student left the focus group still shaking her head. We reassured her that for her paper she could indeed reflect on her persisting confusion and doubt. But, not wanting to give up, she read through the transcript again, and she experienced her "aha!" Still a biologist

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and positivist to the core, she sees that there are other questions to ask and had added interviews to the data collection section of her proposal.

Sally: "I was intrigued by the entire process! I never really considered the amount of time involved in qualitative research, nor the reflection and cross-discussion that the analysis requires. The qualitative process necessitates that we look beyond the 'tally marks' and acknowledge the incredible number of variables that impact the participants. It is their story that needs to be told, and as accurately and descriptively as possible."

Roundtable Responses. With the first class, we used a typical academic final examination. However, when we reflected on what we wanted to accomplish, particularly the objective of multiple realities, we decided that a different culminating activity would provide a better experience for the students and more useful information for us. In the final activity, we divided them into groups and gave them two tasks. Each was assigned a discussion question, such as:

- Why is there such a gap between research and practice in education and what can be done about it?
- Compare researcher bias as a problem in qualitative and quantitative research.
- Compare and contrast the notion of causation in qualitative and quantitative traditions. Is feasible to be an eclectic researcher and remain intellectually honest given the conflicting paradigms?

The students' task was to discuss the topic, bringing to bear what they had learned in the semester, and report out their results. Also, each group was given another group's question and told to prepare "zingers" or questions that would get at difficult issues inherent in any solution to a problem question.

We were pleased with the responses and zinger questions. Once again demonstrating the effectiveness of our facilitator stance, the class zingers truly facilitated class debate. Some examples of findings and zingers:

"Can a quantitative researcher be a philosopher?"
"Ideology and cultural bias can be a problem in quantitative research"
"What are the conflicting paradigms?"
"What will you do if the results of your qualitative study are at odds with the quantitative study?"

In response to the feasibility of working in conflicting paradigms:

"No, because you are looking at different truths."

"Yes, it is developmental. Qualitative can lead to quantitative."
"Complementary and supportive."
"Asking different questions"
"Need to be consistently aware of standards, values, and procedures regardless of method."

From these responses it is clear that students were grappling with the major issues of the competing methodologies. For others, the responses showed an awareness that the methodologies may be poles of a continuum.

Statistical Problem Set The problem set requirement included a set of 10 research scenarios with abbreviated data sets. Students were required to select four and (1) determine the appropriate analysis, (2) set up the analysis, (3) perform the calculations, and (4) interpret the results. All but 4 of the students were able to complete this task correctly.

Proposals Some proposals were nearly ready for dissertation, while other students were investigating their questions and reviewing the knowledge base in their fields for the first time. In the process of developing methodologies, some students substituted their preferred orientation to the opposite method to better answer the question. Topics ranged from (1) sexual deviance in the priesthood and (2) leadership qualities of principals in the 21st contrary to (3) counseling urban minority youth and (4) developmentally appropriate curriculum and academic achievement in second graders. Each student presented his/her proposal to the entire class. After conferences, several were encouraged to continue with different aspects of the proposal until they met standards.

Interviews with Successive Teachers Because of changes in faculty schedules, the first group that we taught (fall of 1994) are just now taking their next research course. The next course is quantitative and focuses on using SPSS to analyze data. The instructor, commented that they "didn't seem any more ignorant than classes in preceding years," but they did seem to be better quality. Efforts to engage in extended dialogue proved fruitless; however, an invitation to observe the students in class did result. We have made plans to do this later on in the semester. For the moment, our working hypothesis is that students have not suffered by receiving fewer class hours in quantitative methods.

Interviews with Students Now in the Next Course Students reactions were that most felt solid where they were in their present quantitative research class. All insisted that the qualitative needed to be in their first course. They stated the important of understanding of studies encountered in reading in their respective disciplines. One student cited her encountering a qualitative article in her reading in science education methods. Another was delighted to be able to understand the focus group method when encountered in reading in her academic field. This

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

has been particularly important for these two cohorts, since they will not be able to take a qualitative methods course until next year (the third year of the program for some).

What was left out? An analysis of previous syllabi for the course showed that several attempts had already been made to integrate qualitative methods. Hence, it was difficult to determine what was not included. Anecdotal data from students indicated, however, that attempts to integrate qualitative methods had been less than successful in practice.

How Did We Do in Awakening Minds to "Confront Multiple Realities"?

What follows are anecdotal data which suggest that students had begun to confront multiple realities.

In the focus group activity, those who role-played the participants were "killing time" and experiencing their own data collection (not related to focus group topic) through observation on the "quad." They made the following discoveries:

- Not given a framework, they quickly found that they needed one and created their own
- They learned how much you can actually see happening when you take the time to look. (Corollary: "People say/do the darndest things.")
- Your own biases and assumptions can get in the way.

Conferencing about her proposal to tell the stories of women on AFDC (welfare) and the barriers they face getting into and staying in college, a student reported that she discovered in the 810 course about the importance of "getting into other people's realities."

Another student wrote in a reflective paper: "Now, though I see it from a more informed and practiced perspective. I find it somewhat amusing that, in the very process of my initial exposure to qualitative research I have undergone the process; I have been changed."

Results and Conclusions

In our team-teaching, we found strategies to help students understand and value both kinds of research, providing a meaningful context and active hands-on learning. With quantitative methods, this "doing" can occur with a data set in a classroom or computer lab. Our experience with qualitative research showed that participation in the process of data collection and data analysis was more successful than text chapters and lectures. Reading well-done research reports from "real life" made many of the students believers, as they felt as if they were really "there"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and could make generalizations to their own school settings. The student proposals began to include both methods in a complementary design.

Team teaching offered us two ways to explain things, strengthened our own teaching through collaboration, and provided our students with a thorough introduction to both qualitative and quantitative methods through our varied perspectives and experiences. Perhaps our most important result was finding our students' eyes opened to multiple ways of asking questions and seeking answers, and beginning to question their taken-for-granted views of the world.

Educational Importance

This innovation began with an awareness of the increasing need for qualitative methods in academic and teacher research. We found that we went beyond the goal of more equal exposure to methodology to a new goal that "emerged": an appreciation for different but complementary paradigms. In our classes, we also developed some strategies and techniques that seemed to work for our students. We hope that our experience will help alleviate the struggles that many educational research faculty have encountered in trying to infuse qualitative research into their existing courses.

One student, summed up in a reflection paper, what we had been trying to accomplish.

....The song is one to be sung. The atonal harmonies and at-first-perplexing rhythms have much to reveal about the music, the internal soul of the people. It's sort of like trying to sing three dimensional sheet music. You have to set it up as a dance. The whole body must be a part.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1967). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Doubleday.

Bogdan, R. C., & Bicklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Dana, N. F. (1994). Holistic perspectives on the teaching of qualitative research methods. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 370 912)

Fraenkel. J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1993). How to design and evaluate research in education (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Laneau, A. (1987). Teaching qualitative methods: The role of classroom activities. Education and Urban Society, 20(1), 86-120.

Leibow, E. (1993). Tell them who I am: The lives of homeless women. New York: Free Press.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). Research in education: A conceptual introduction (3rd. ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Oldfather, P., & West, J. (1994). Qualitative research as jazz. Educational Researcher, 23(8), 23-26.

Parrott, S. (1972). Games children play: Ethnography of a second grade recess. In J. Spradley & D. McCurdy (Eds.), The cultural experience: Ethnography in a complex society pp. 207-219.

Peshkin, A. (1986). God's choice: The total world of a fundamentalist Christian school. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Rubin, L. (1976). Worlds of pain: Life in the working-class family. New York: Basic Books.

Shulman. L. S. (1981). Disciplines of inquiry. Educational Researcher, 10(6), 5-12.

Stallings, W. M. (1995). Confessions of a quantitative educational researcher trying to

teach qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 24(3), 31-32.

The Butler Group (1996). What is BPR? Found at http://www.bultergroup .co.uk/ butgrp/issues/bpriss01.htm

Webb, R. B., & Glesne, C. (1992). Teaching qualitative research. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), The handbook of qualitative research in education (pp. 771-814). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Williams, T. M. (1989). The cocaine kids: The inside story of a teenage drug ring. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Whyte, W. F. (1955). Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1987). Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines. New York: Longman, Inc.